

207
R539

Class 207

Book R539

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK.

Besides the main topic, this book also treats of

Subject No.

On page

Subject No.

On page



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-BPY-795

269
36

A PAPER
READ BEFORE THE
FACULTY CLUB
OF THE
**GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY**

BY
DEAN ROBBINS

AND PRINTED AT THE REQUEST
OF THE FACULTY



A. D. 1914

Published
Jan 1914

A PRESSING EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM

No one who has any interest in the subject of theological education can well escape in these days certain moments of heart-searching reflection. Theology would appear to be in a somewhat parlous state. Once she was accounted the Queen of the Sciences, now she is little better than a pariah on the extremest outskirts of good scholastic society, and her discipline is discounted as insignificant amidst the more important movements of the educational world. The gibe cast at theological seminaries is a commonplace. We expect it not only from those whose interests are avowedly alien but even from leaders of religious thought. Traditional theological training has become to the minds of many synonymous with futility and ineptitude.

It is a little disconcerting when a distinguished bishop can write to a prospective candidate for Orders,—“I should hardly advise your going to a theological school. I am sure that you would find the courses of study of little advantage, and the life narrow and extremely irksome.” What alternative was proposed does not appear, but this negative counsel is not an imaginary case, the words are a genuine quotation and the sentiment which they express is widely typical. Our current theological education is charged on every side with being effete in method and inadequate in result, and there is a curiously prevalent tone of hopelessness in the criticism. However ignorant and crass the forms in which these strictures often find utterance, the general clamor against our present system is a matter to be reckoned with. In view of this wide-spread dissatisfaction we can hardly remain perfectly quiescent. Either apology is in order or reform.

Of course, one is tempted to mitigate the weight of censure by diverting attention to the larger question of our present educational situation as a whole. As an English critic recently remarked, we are discussing education in America with such unmeasured zeal that we would almost seem to have forgotten to practise it. Whether we look to consistency of theory or to practical results, the present outlook is characterized rather by zeal and novelty of enterprise than by assured achievement.

In primary education great questions of fundamental principle are still at issue. On the one hand stands the plea for liberty, for work disguised as play, for guidance along the line of least resistance where the stimulus of pleasurable emotion shall be constant. Over against this the old scruple still persists that it is of prime importance to train the will in obedience, that the strain of painful effort has distinct educational value, that interest roused by the sense of overcoming difficulties is more effective than mere genial acquiescence in what is obviously attractive. The question of practical method thus raised is still waiting for adjustment, we are still to a great extent in the stage of controversy and experiment.

Our much-vaunted Common School system is often taken for granted, but a moment's thought makes it evident that the term is too vague, that it covers too wide a variety of educational procedure, to serve purposes of argument,—except indeed as a rhetorical peg on which to hang a bit of patriotic self-glorification. It is *not* a system, it is a congeries of a hundred systems bound together by the loosely-defined aim of diffusing intelligence as broadly as possible. Its results are as yet seriously problematical, both as regards efficiency in preparing the average American child for the practical exigencies of life, and as imparting even the rudiments of a genuine intellectual culture.

It is the same when we come to the secondary school and the college. The former is hampered in its free development by the incubus of college entrance examinations, and the lack of any reasonable correlation of its work with that of the subsequent University course. I recently heard a group of professors belonging to a scientific Faculty discuss the value of the training in natural science given in the preparatory school. The unanimous verdict appeared to be that it was worthless, and that they preferred to deal in the University with students who were unspoiled by this superficial travesty of scientific procedure. The truth is that an enormous waste of energy marks the whole course of secondary education. Nor does the old controversy between advocates of the Humanities and those whose interest is predominantly scientific seem much nearer settlement. Our colleges at present exemplify a mere compromise as between a general cultural aim and early vocational specialization. The result is that the student is confused by conflicting ideals, and often

misses the best that either of the proposed methods consistently followed might accomplish.

It is clear, then, that Seminaries are not alone in their shortcoming. In large measure they merely reflect the confusions which characterize the whole field of education. It is to be hoped that we are working out slowly toward a more intelligent grasp of the problems in question, but all is still largely tentative and experimental, we can boast but the crude beginnings of a rational educational system.

And yet it must be acknowledged that all this has only a somewhat remote bearing on the subject originally proposed for consideration. One does not prove himself innocent by implicating others in guilt. The practical contention is that our Seminaries are not abreast of other professional schools, that they lag notably behind the general marching line of educational progress. With certain qualifications the charge seems to me justified and the arraignment is too serious to be met by mere generalities, by vague suggestion of extenuating circumstances.

There are doubtless certain reasons which can be more or less validly urged by way of excuse. Intellectual reconstructions are always notoriously slow in the religious sphere. Deep instincts of the heart, sentiments endeared by sacred association and of proved practical value, array themselves against the recognition of new ideas. This conservative tendency has obvious usefulness, however irritating to the zeal of the radical reformer, but educationally it means that the theological school has to make its reckoning with a vast mass of firmly-entrenched opinion which is singularly indifferent to the specific interests of a purely intellectual discipline. Moreover formal affiliation with institutional Christianity reinforces this reactionary tendency. Doubtless in all professional schools the force of conservative tradition may at times restrain and hamper the bolder spirit of innovation. But religious orthodoxy is notoriously argus-eyed in its jealous watchfulness. I am not complaining. I regard these restrictions of liberty as more or less inevitable, and in certain aspects salutary. But the probable effect on educational development is clear, the theological school cannot well be the home of bold experiment, it must almost of necessity seem to move slowly as compared with more independent institutions.

Nor may we forget the fact that the theological school is generally far less closely in touch with University life than the Law, the Medical, and the Technical School. It is thus in great measure out of the immediate current of educational advancement. We may deplore this fact but it is hard to see how it can be remedied. A Seminary may have relations of mutual comity with a neighboring University, and thus subject itself more or less to the somewhat impalpable influence of a wider and freer academic life. But essentially its position is isolated and apart; its government is entirely distinct, its standards are its own, its competition with other schools is concerned less with the question of scholarly efficiency than with considerations ecclesiastical and quasi-sentimental. Thus it escapes a certain healthy friction and is not infrequently the prey of a stupid self-complacency.

He would be a bold man indeed who believed that he had discovered a panacea for this somewhat depressing state of affairs. To be sure there are not lacking critics whose confident tone would seem to indicate that they are possessed of the saving secret. But too often they prove to be individuals quite innocent of any practical academic experience, and chiefly distinguished by profound ignorance of the complexities of the problem which they propose to solve. My present task is far humbler. I can but throw out certain hints toward a solution, raise one or two questions which touch on the outskirts of a vast subject. But at least I hope to be constructive in spirit, not merely one more voice in the babel of fruitless condemnation.

As one considers the traditional theological course in the light of concrete examples, of the individual men who are subjected to its discipline, the first doubt which arises in the mind is concerning the time which at present is devoted to the study of Hebrew and Greek. Are not our Seminaries, as at present constituted, laboring under what may be called a kind of language obsession? I beg you to mark that I am not here arguing on the ground of any abstract theory. Theoretically I am entirely at one with those who hold strongly by the old classical tradition. I have yet to be convinced that any other discipline can equal a thorough training in Latin and Greek as laying the foundation of a broad and deep culture. Entirely aside from the advantage of conversance with an unrivalled literature, the enfranchisement of thought through sympathetic contact with the great achievements

of Roman and Greek life, there seems to me no better mental discipline than this same linguistic drill. I would put Greek, along with Mathematics, as perhaps the best of all training for the logical faculty, the best field in which to learn subtlety of mental discrimination, the nice perception of difference, upon which all accuracy of thought rests. But this has no immediate bearing on the problem in hand. The Seminary, as a simple matter of fact, cannot bear the brunt of any such task,—it is not her function that she should. The present theological curriculum was formulated to meet the needs of students already grounded in the classics. This is a condition which does not hold today. The University no longer guarantees any knowledge of Greek by the bestowal of its Bachelor's degree. The majority of our candidates come to the Seminary today about as ignorant of Greek as of Chinese, and yet the theological curriculum stands unmodified. Greek the student *must* learn, and Hebrew too unless a merciful bishop dispenses him. And then begins a grind on language lasting for three years, undertaken at an age when the acquisition of new languages has become for most men exceedingly difficult, and when a whole new world of knowledge in other fields is insistently demanding attention.

But we are warned that we must not lower the academic standard, that the Church needs a learned ministry, that problems of Biblical criticism are so pressing that more than ever before the priest has need of command of the original sources. To my own mind it is perfectly clear that each item in this protest is merely an elaborate begging of the question. Nothing today so lowers the standard of scholarship in our Seminaries as the miserable makeshift of knowledge which must needs be accepted in Greek and Hebrew as sufficing for a pass-grade. It is, in the majority of cases, simply an impossibility that a man of average ability, beginning Greek and Hebrew at the age of twenty-two, and studying them for three years as only one item in a heavy schedule, should ever attain scholarly proficiency in these languages. He is bound to spend a large part of his time in work which he will never make use of after he graduates, and which as an intellectual discipline is, under the circumstances, of very doubtful value. To train ten good Grecians and Hebraists, choosing men properly prepared and enthusiastic, and freeing them from the handicap of association with merely perfunctory class-room

work, would do more to raise the scholarly standard among our clergy than to turn out a hundred of these make-believe scholars who have frittered away precious time, against the grain, in uncongenial and fruitless labor. Is there a similar waste of energy, a like absurd resultant of mere pretence of knowledge, in any reputable professional course outside of our Seminaries? I should doubt it. Yet this anachronism is the corner-stone of the curriculum prescribed by canon, an accepted tradition so firmly entrenched that to question it is seriously to risk the respectability of one's academic reputation. No half-measure seems to promise relief. Why should not Greek and Hebrew be made elective, open to those who have special linguistic aptitude and whose previous academic work fits them to pursue this course? The objection which is sometimes urged that this would tend to a kind of class distinction among the clergy, more or less detrimental to those who lacked the sign-manual of the higher professional training, is hardly worth rebuttal. It rests upon a total misconception of the general esteem in which classical scholarship is held today. Meanwhile the fear that under such circumstances the study of Greek and Hebrew would languish and in the end die out in our Seminaries is merely a bit of cowardly faithlessness. Those who honestly believe in its value must surely have confidence in its inherent power of attraction, just as the true Grecian never doubts an ultimate reaction from the neglect which has temporarily overtaken the study of the classics in our Universities. Such study will stand or fall in the long run by its own intrinsic value. It is a counsel of despair to prop it up, according to our present habit, by exacting poor work out of unsuitable and reluctant material, and in the process sacrificing irrecoverable opportunities.

One ought perhaps to add, in order to guard against misconstruction, that this proposal to make Hebrew and Greek elective is not meant to prejudice the question of offering elementary work in Greek for beginners, in the hope of enabling them to read the New Testament in the original with more or less facility before the end of their course. But it is clear to my mind that this should not be imposed on all students who lack previous classical training, and that at no period should these men be allowed to hamper the work of the more advanced student by being classed with those already proficient in Greek.

Having cleared the ground by relieving the Seminarian of the incubus of obligatory tasks for which he is unfitted, where shall we look for a constructive principle of guidance? A rational educational theory is not erected *in vacuo*, it must be suited to the special needs of a definite environment. It will hardly be disputed that the burden of Apology rests heavily on the Christian ministry today. The task is laid upon us in peculiar measure so to present the Gospel that it shall make appeal to men whose intelligence has largely revolted from the truths of Christianity as traditionally interpreted. The air is full, indeed, of optimistic comment on the idealistic reaction which is said to characterize more recent philosophic thought. The crass materialism of a generation ago, with its attempt to reduce all things to a mechanical basis, is out of court. Religion is widely recognized as an inevitable and valuable phase of human experience. Even distinctively Christian ideals have received a certain philosophical imprimatur recently, provided only that they be recognized as of purely human origin, and be not too confidently ascribed to the direct teaching of Jesus Christ. But never before, I believe, was the battle more clearly aligned over the question of the historic Christ, and over the claim that He is in His proper Person the full and final revelation of God. At first sight it may seem an irrational procedure that so protean a foe as popular unbelief should be accepted as in any degree a dominant factor in determining the structural outline of a theological curriculum. But there must be a philosophically correlated order of studies in such a course if it is to be properly effective. The old haphazard method of teaching anything and everything at once, if only the ground specified in canons be somehow covered, must yield place. A fit of violent mental indigestion, often issuing in permanent dyspeptic disabilities, is the result of the present ill-considered system. And the doubts of the age are at least suggestive as indicating a certain fundamental intellectual attitude of the modern mind, which may help in determining the order of studies suited to the requirements of the student today. On the one hand we have learned the infinite sacredness of all religious experience. The great religions of the world, under the light of sympathetic critical study, have revealed treasures of unsuspected wisdom. We can no longer completely isolate the religion of Israel from the wider religious development of the

world. The word revelation itself no longer connotes a clearly defined conception applicable only within a sharply restricted area. The question becomes insistent,—What is the relation of Jesus Christ to this world-wide religious yearning and aspiration of the human heart? The divine answer and the culmination, we assert. Yes,—but in what exact sense? With what measure of divine authority? With what degree of permanence and certitude? Is it to the Jesus of the Gospels that we must look, or to an ideal Christ of the age-long Christian consciousness? Here lies the crux of the problem which confronts us. And these questionings are not significant of a sporadic skepticism which the Christian priest must needs meet in some external and formal fashion. They are the heritage today of every man who *thinks*; they enter into the very warp and woof of the modern mind.

The inference would seem to me to be plain. At the very beginning of the theological course we are bound to provide a certain propaedeutic in the shape of the Philosophy of Religion and a thorough study of Comparative Religion. I am aware that with the student material at our command the problem presents great practical difficulty. Cogent reasons may be urged for first building up a content of positive Christian teaching in minds largely untrained and often startlingly ignorant of the first principles of Catholic theology. But, of course, the training proposed would include the whole subject of Hebrew and Christian origins, and thus the study of the Bible, with its fundamental theological outlines, would run parallel with the more philosophical and critical work, and should be given a place of due prominence. And incidentally could there be better foundation laid by way of missionary preparation? Surely effective approach is here conditional on sympathetic understanding of the religious history and genius of the native people whom we would serve, thus only can special needs and aptitudes be met and utilized. But above all else this method gives promise of stirring the student to think for himself at the very beginning of his course. He will be effectually awakened from that childish mood which sometimes prevails, as though the function of a theological school were to dole out ready-made information which has but to be learned in order that all problems should somehow solve themselves and priestly work be rendered magically efficacious.

Of course the exact apportionment of this fundamental groundwork to various departments is a matter of detail upon which we cannot now enter. It is self-evident that Apologetics must not be limited to any exclusive line of approach. In thus emphasizing the place of Comparative Religion no such limitation was intended. The very phrase Comparative Religion has more or less fallen into disrepute, in certain quarters, as connoting a doctrinaire investigation of religious cults as barren in result as the superficial summaries of the traditional History of Philosophy. But my plea is for the implanting of a sympathetic understanding of the evolution of the religious consciousness of mankind, in order that the Bible may be studied in the light of this worldwide revelation of the divine, and that the Gospel may be apprehended as the culmination not of Hebrew development alone, but of the whole religious process of history.

Having said this much I feel bound to advert for a moment to a countervailing principle which may perhaps have been obscured. Does it follow that under these new conditions the Seminary will have resolved itself into what is primarily no more than a school of philosophic investigation? Must the note of authority, the sense of being the purveyor of a deposit of the Faith, be lost? Strange confusion of mind seems to exist as to the very meaning of any such claim. We hear of theological class-rooms where the *ipse dixit* of the professor is accounted the last court of appeal; of dogmatic teaching which must be so accepted in minutest detail as to crush out originality of thought and the spirit of honest investigation. That such a travesty of authority may exist is possible, but it must be in regions remote from those with which most of us have experience. Divergence of opinion, radical differences of theological temper and point of view, among the various members of a theological Faculty, are far more likely to cause confusion in the mind of the student, than is any united attempt to dragoon him into a predetermined groove likely to crush out independence of judgment. But even so there may be and there should be the note of authority in the general atmosphere of theological education. All questions are not open, there is a consensus of the Faith, to be accepted or rejected, but with which we are not free to play fast and loose. This I take it is essential to the life of any society which aspires to a unity like that of the Church. Difficult to define in its exact

limits, hard to explicate in the detail of its promulgation, there yet exists a corporate agreement concerning the central verities of the Faith, which breeds in those who submit to its authority a certain humility of intellectual temper, a sensitiveness to the danger of rash individual judgments, which befits the man weighted with the responsibility of the cure of souls. Two illustrations may make my meaning clearer. One of the foremost of English theologians said to me years ago, when question had been raised as to the soundness of certain theological positions which he had championed,—“If I could be convinced that any speculation of mine contravened a clear decision of the Church I should recant on the instant.” Granted the vagueness of the phrase, “a clear decision of the Church,” granted the difficulty inherent in any attempt to bring specific opinions to this bar of judgment, there lay behind the words the childlike spirit of one who had a vision of a corporate wisdom wider and deeper than his own, and who was sustained and ennobled by it. Again I remember the words of a radical Broad Churchman and a biblical critic of eminence who, when discussing the subject of the Virgin Birth of our Lord, confessed to me that it was only the consensus of the Church which added the necessary weight which inclined his judgment to a frank acceptance of the doctrine. “Without this I should not believe the fact, with this evidence I do accept it,” were his exact words. To breed within the student this quick sense of a body of truth which has the suffrage of the Christian ages, while granting him the widest privilege of free investigation and encouraging virility of independent judgment, is to fulfil the ideal task of the modern Seminary. To some the two will seem incompatible, but hardly so to those who believe in the Incarnation as embodying a revelation of God distinctive in its unique authority, or who acknowledge any claim of the Church’s corporate life over the unrestrained play of individual opinion.

On a par in importance with this thorough grounding in the history of the religious consciousness of the race stands Ethics. The theoretic and speculative treatment cannot be ignored, historical comparisons are of the utmost importance, but I believe that the crying need is for a thoroughly developed modern Christian casuistry, an exposition of the ethics of the Gospel which shall throw light on the duty of the Christian amidst the complexities of Twentieth Century civilization. Christianity is

primarily a *life*, not a doctrine. That the heralding of Jesus Christ as the Way of Life entails dogmatic definition to a greater or less degree cannot be denied. But to divert interest from the concrete reality to the mere abstract statement of the manner and method of the divine revelation, to conceive that salvation is a matter of correct theory rather than of redeemed life, is the most soul-destroying heresy of the ages. Meanwhile are our clergy trained to lead in the vanguard of moral progress? How many of them are competent to preach a sermon on the ethics of the Gospel which will throw clear light on a man's duty amidst the mazes of modern business competition or the corrupt and selfish materialism of the social life of the day? I am not now speaking of impressive rhetorical appeals, but of the clean-cut solution of specific problems in the light of the teaching of Jesus Christ. Bergson's contention that the reason why men fail to do the right is because they are completely bewildered in the presence of conflicting claims, and do not know where the path of duty lies, expresses at least an important half-truth. The age craves moral guidance and leadership. What is the Church doing to meet the need? For my own part, I believe that the decay of the Church's influence is largely due to the fact that she has ceased to stand preëminently for righteousness, that she is notoriously given to moral compromise in the presence of strong vested interests, that the revolutionary character of her original charter has become hopelessly obscured by the complacent selfishness of those within her borders who have mistaken the Church for a kind of transcendental life-insurance company. She no longer turns the world upside down with the zeal of her charity. She is content to be the refuge of those who offset a life of moral mediocrity by the performance of certain formal religious duties, and the somewhat perfunctory support of a more or less amateurish philanthropy. It can hardly be hoped that the teaching of ethics will of itself produce prophets of righteousness. But we can at least bring the importance of the problem to the front and point the distinction between easy-going moral platitudes and the intensely practical demand of the Gospel standard. And probably here is the best point of vantage from which to bring a theological course into some sort of touch with the modern advance in sociological and economic theory. We are already laboring under too great a variety of subjects. It is not the part of wisdom to seek to

make the curriculum encyclopaedic in its inclusiveness. But the study of social conditions and of the manifold philanthropic organization which an awakened social conscience has devised for the amelioration of abuses, will naturally play its part in the attempt to define the Christian's duty as he seeks to live in accord with the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount.

Having laid the foundation, then, in a knowledge of the theory and the practice of religion, paralleled by study of the Bible,—in Greek and Hebrew for those competent to work in the original, and in English for others,—one would pass on to the study of Church history and polity and of theology proper, basing the latter on the biblical theology already acquired. So intimately are the departments of ecclesiastical history and theology necessarily associated that it is useless to try to guard against overlapping. Theology can only be understood by a knowledge of its historical development, and ecclesiastical history is little more than glorified biography save as it traces with nice attention to detail the formative influence of theological ideas on the corporate life of the Christian community. But the point of importance here is the postponement of formal theological teaching until a sufficient foundation has been laid in the general history of religious thought to enable the student to appreciate the real significance of the Church's systematic speculation on things divine. Liturgies, pedagogy, pastoral care, homiletics, elocution, music, these must all be provided for. Probably elocution, in the sense of voice culture and practice in extempore speaking, should receive far more emphasis than has commonly been accorded it; it has so much to do with the art of persuasion that its importance is self-evident. But it is no part of my purpose to elaborate a full schedule, nor are we now immediately concerned with details of scholastic method. My aim has been merely to suggest reform on certain broad lines of general principle. But I cannot refrain from a moment's reference to certain outworn traditions which might well be honored in the breach.

It is sometimes assumed that the so-called lecture-system is an advance on the old-fashioned class-room method of hearing recitations. This, however, is perhaps not so clear as it appears to be on the surface. In so far as the lecture-system means the elaborate and finished presentment of the subject in hand, in such

a way as to exploit the cleverness and learning of the professor, and to impart information ready-made at the price of a little perfunctory note-taking, there is little to be said for it from the educational point of view. Aside from the lamentable waste of time involved in writing out what might just as well have been read in printed form, it seems to be forgotten that the prime function of the teacher is to induce the student to do work for himself. Predigested food, when used as habitual diet, is as bad for the mind as the body. The teacher should instruct in method, should guide and criticize and inspire, but he should not do all the *thinking* required. Probably the piling up of facts in the memory, the acquirement of mere information, is in general too highly rated. It demands but a low grade of mental effort and may even at times hinder intellectual development by clogging the mind with heterogeneous matter. The *search* for facts, critical selection and the exercise of judgment in correlating them, this disciplines the mind. But when the preliminary work is all done by proxy, and the student is bewildered unless the mass of facts presented is sifted and conclusions carefully drawn by someone else, the mind is merely pampered in its lazy habit. This proposition seems simple enough in the statement, in words it appears fairly innocuous, but it contains dynamite enough to shatter countless comfortable academic retreats and distract distinguished professors with a whole new world of scruples. Can it be that more is required than that a man should be learned, abreast of the times in knowledge, intellectually apt in making appeal to the interest of the student, in order that he should take high academic rank as a teacher? The truth is that he may be all this and yet lack the first elements of true educational ability. Under this new interpretation of the teacher's function the alluring vision of lectures finished once for all, ready for service year after year with only slight amendment and revision, is dissipated forever. In its place stretches the vista of toilsome years, each distinct in its demands and requiring an ever new adaptation of material and method to the sharply individualized needs of a shifting constituency. It is comparatively easy to formulate our own thoughts and present them with clearness and cogency. But who shall estimate the burden of sympathetically taking the student's point of view, understanding his limitations and encouraging his inchoate endeavor at thought, making him do work

himself which one impatiently longs to do for him. In this there is no glow of satisfaction such as accompanies the eloquent deliverance of one's own opinions, and the meed of ready applause is lacking, for the student himself is not always appreciative of efforts made in his behalf. No wonder then that reform in this regard makes slow progress, and that practice lags far behind theory.

Passing reference has already been made to the crowding of the curriculum with too great a variety of subjects. This is a matter of serious concern in wellnigh the whole course of education. The necessity of covering a wide field in a limited space of time plays havoc with the ideal suggested by reason and common-sense. With advancing maturity there is less need of frequent diversion in order to secure mental freshness. It can hardly be doubted that most men get their best results from concentration on two or three closely allied lines of study for considerable periods. In my own experience I remember a year devoted exclusively to Greek and Mathematics as not only the pleasantest but probably the most profitable period of my student life. It would be well if never more than three subjects ran parallel with one another in the curriculum. And though this may often prove impracticable we may at least seek to approximate to it. Along with this it is generally recognized that the schedule of hours required in the class-room should be reduced. Especially is this true in the case of the more advanced and scholarly among the students. Time must be allowed for independent work, for investigation of original sources, collateral reading, the writing of theses etc. With the passing of the formal lecture opportunity will offer for reform along these lines. And it is likely that conference with individuals, the meeting of small groups of carefully graded students, a largely increased use of Seminar methods, will more or less displace the gathering of a so-called class for a wearisome succession of hours, which hangs like a nightmare in the memory of our own student days.

But I have been led, I fear, by personal interest into details which are hardly germane to a paper like the present essay. The point which I would emphasize is simply that the present situation calls for two drastic reforms. The first is that the old pseudo-classical ideal should be recognized for what it is, a hopelessly ineffective anachronism. Theoretically it is appalling, I

grant, to think of religious teachers ignorant of the languages in which the literary charter of their Faith is enshrined. But practically the majority of them are ignorant now, and by pretending to instruct them and failing we are marking time while the rest of the world advances, and we are losing inestimable opportunities of preparing Seminarians for their future work. Meanwhile I beg to insist that this is no counsel of despair as regards the future of classical scholarship. I believe that the adoption of a broader policy would ultimately issue in a revival of interest in both Hebrew and Greek, and that when the incubus of an unqualified obligation is lifted renewed zeal will be stirred and work can be accomplished in these departments which is worth the while.

And, secondly, this removal of the language barrier would open the door to a thorough reconstruction of the curriculum on lines consonant with the intellectual emphasis of modern thought. It would enable us to lay a broader philosophical foundation for the study of theology; to ground ecclesiastical history in a knowledge of the origins of all religious institutionalism; to meet the special apologetic need of the day by a thorough-going examination of the claims of historic Christianity in the light of a world-wide religious consciousness.

I would only say in conclusion that if the problem is to be worked out to a successful issue it must be by the way of granting larger freedom to Theological Faculties rather than by looking to definitive Canonical legislation. Remove restrictions, if you will, but do not trust too implicitly in programs drawn up by mixed Commissions and Committees. And perhaps if Diocesan standards, formulated by more or less irresponsible Boards of Examiners, loomed less portentous on the horizon, it might make for the development of our Seminaries in the production of a more worthy type of scholarship.

59084

207

Robbins, W.L. D.D.

R539

A pressing educational

problem

8 DEC
1938

Log

17 DEC
1938

T.L.

NOV 1938

207

R 539

59084

0

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



00056735



C0-BPY-795